This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE,

UNITED STATES SENATE,

ON THE

JOINT RESOLUTION (S. R. 53) PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES EXTENDING THE RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE TO WOMEN.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1902.

324.3
L62.2

324.3
462.2

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *Tuesday, February 18, 1902.*

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m. Present: Senators Bacon (chairman), Berry, Wetmore, Bard, and Mitchell. Also, Miss Susan B. Anthony, Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton, Miss Harriet May Mills, Mrs. Lucretia L. Blankenburg, Rev. Olympia Brown, Miss Gail Laughlin, Mrs. Jennie A. Brown, Mrs. Mary W. Swift, Mrs. Lucy Hobart Day, Miss Alice Stone Blackwell, Mrs. Mariana W. Chapman, Mrs. Gudrun Drewsen, Miss Vida Goldstein, Mrs. Emmy Evald, Rev. Anna H. Shaw, and other representatives of the National American Woman Suffrage Association.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee have met this morning to hear such remarks as may be submitted upon the joint resolution now pending in the Senate, providing for an amendment to the Constitution in the interest of impartial suffrage. After having the resolution read by the clerk, the committee will surrender control of all the details of the meeting entirely to the officers of your association, in order that they may indicate who shall speak and the length of time which shall be occupied by each speaker. The clerk will now read the resolution, in order that it may be before the committee.

The clerk read as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION (S. R. 53) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE .

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

STATEMENT OF MISS SUSAN B. ANTHONY.

Miss ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is the seventeenth Congress that has been addressed by the women of this nation. That means that we have been coming to Congress thirty-three years. In 1887 the Senate brought the bill to a discussion and to a vote.

We ask for a sixteenth amendment because your honorable body, the Congress of the United States, has power to submit the proposition to the legislatures of the several States, and it is much easier to canvass a legislature—it is much easier to persuade the members of a legislature to pass on the ratification of this amendment—than it is to get the whole three millions or six millions, as the case may be, of the rank and file of the men of the different States to vote for it.

I appeal to you that you bring this question before the Senate of the United States. I think we are of as much importance as are the Filipinos, Porto Ricans, Hawaiians, Cubans, and all of the different sorts of men that you have before you. [Laughter.] When you get those men, you have an ignorant and unlettered set of people, who know nothing about our institutions.

The 600 women teachers sent over to the Philippines are a thousand times better qualified than are the men who go there to make money. The women go there to teach, to educate, and to get something to build a State upon.

The women of the islands, as well as the women at home, are quite as well qualified to govern and have the charge of affairs in their hands as are the men.

But I do not propose to talk this morning. I am simply here to introduce those who are to address you.

I have here the report of the hearing two years ago, which contains a statement of the workings of suffrage in the different States of the Union. This report is published at the expense of Uncle Sam. The only thing we ever get out of him is the printing of that document. [Laughter.] This bears the frank of Hon. Cushman K. Davis, and during his lifetime these reports were sent over the country in that way. Before that the reports of these hearings were sent out under the frank of Senator Daniel, former chairman of the committee, and we shall expect Senator Bacon and Senator Berry and all of you gentlemen to do your part. Senator Mitchell here is an old war horse. I traveled with him thirty-one years ago over the Union Pacific, and we were snowed in together for nine days. [Laughter.]

Senator MITCHELL. We got pretty well acquainted then, did we not?

Miss ANTHONY. Yes; and you have been a good suffrage man ever since.

Senator MITCHELL. You made one convert.

Miss ANTHONY. Yes; and there were several others. A man came to me at the hotel the other night, who was with us on that trip, who remembered the trials we had.

I now have the pleasure of introducing Harriet May Mills, the organizer of New York State.

STATEMENT OF MISS HARRIET MAY MILLS.

Miss MILLS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I speak this morning as a taxpayer, in behalf of the great principle that taxation without representation is tyranny; not because I believe that the only women who should vote are those who are taxed, but because I believe that taxpaying women suffer an added injustice, since they are not only governed by laws which they can not help to make, but because they also are obliged to pay taxes while they are powerless to levy.

This great principle, of course, is not a new one to us. But there are people in these days who say that all those great declarations of the fathers are outgrown. It seems to me we do not realize that the women of to-day are much larger shareholders in the Government than they have ever been before, and we can not certainly believe that the principles for which our fathers died will ever be outgrown.

In my State of New York we tried a few years ago to make a list of the taxpaying women, and although it was necessarily more or less imperfect, we found that outside of New York City, in three-fourths of the towns and villages of the State, the women paid taxes on $369,000,000. I notice in the press a statement somebody has made lately that the women of New York State pay taxes on over $100,000,000. They must certainly pay taxes on three or four times as much as that. In one city, near my own home, a recent investigation has been made, and we find there that women pay as much as one-half, that they are assessed on $5,032,476 real and personal property, and that they also own a great deal of stock in the banks and other large corporations.

Of 88 stockholders in one national bank in that city, 50 are women; so that it is fair to estimate that the women pay at least one-half of the taxes, and I believe that this city is not exceptional in my State.

The other day in our convention we took a vote to determine the number of women present who paid taxes. All who paid taxes were asked to rise, and out of some 300 women all save 20 rose, showing the great proportion of women who to-day are directly assisting in the support of the Government. This is largely due, of course, to two great influences: First, the fact that women can now own property, whether married or single.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century no married woman could own a cent of property. At the beginning of the twentieth century women, married or single, may own and often do own millions.

In Chicago the largest schedules of personal tax that were filed recently were filed by two women, Mrs. Emmons Blaine and Mrs. Mary Sturgis. I suppose that does not mean that they necessarily had the largest amount of personal property, but they confessed to all they had. [Laughter.]

Then another reason for this large increase in the property of women is that they are now allowed to earn their own living in almost any business, and there are to-day at least 4,000,000 of us earning independent incomes. We feel that it is a great injustice, gentlemen, when we are such large shareholders in the Government, when we are such large participants in business affairs, to be denied any voice in the Government.

It was quite different in the old days, when married women were always under tutelage and had no rights of their own, when they did not even own the clothes they wore. There might have been a little more justice in giving the votes to the man and denying it to the woman, but certainly it can not be fair to-day.

Some people say that this property is all represented by the men, and that they cast the votes for us. Gentlemen, in my State of New York there are 40,000 more women than men; and is it not a great burden to put upon the men to ask them to represent not only themselves, but 40,000 more women than the double of themselves?

I do not see how it is possible for any man to represent a woman. In Belgium I believe they have a law which gives a married man two

votes, but we have no such law in our country; and even that law does not stipulate that the second vote shall always express the opinion of the wife. So that even there a man does not usually represent his wife.

In our constitutional convention, in 1894, we had a glaring instance of the way men sometimes represent their wives. There was a woman there who was very much interested in the amendment which we hoped to have submitted, striking the word "male" from the State constitution. She was very much interested all through the campaign, and on the night when the vote was taken was very much excited lest her husband should not express her opinion. He expressed it by voting the other way. [Laughter.] And I am quite sure that men very often express their wives' opinions in that way. It is quite right that they should express their own opinions and not those of their wives.

We are not asking this because we are women or because we want anything that is not justly ours; but we are asking justice for the excluded class, which now happens to be women, in this country.

The principle that taxation and representation are inseparable is being taught very well to the children in a little republic in our State—the George Junior Republic. There they are trying to institute a true republic among these young boys and girls. A few years ago the girls thought, as some women think to-day, that they did not wish to vote, and there was a boy running for president who was very much opposed to the enfranchisement of the girls, and he said: "It would be unwomanly for you to vote. You do not wish to vote, do you?" And somebody foolishly said they did not. But a little while afterwards a tax was levied, and the girls found that they were taxed much more heavily in the republic than the boys, and then they began to open their eyes, and they thought if it was womanly for a girl to pay her taxes, and to pay such heavy taxes, it might be womanly for her to vote and decide what the taxes should be. That is the justice we ask at your hands to-day; and I say there can be no reason for denying to public shareholders the same rights that we give to private shareholders in all the corporations of this country.

People say this principle is dead, that it is outgrown, but, gentlemen, our forefathers did not believe that. There was once a man named John Hampden, and when he was called to pay a tax unjustly levied he said, "No, gentlemen, I would be content to loan my King, but I fear to call down upon my head the curses pronounced in Magna Charta against anyone who thus broke or disregarded its provisions." He was rewarded by imprisonment in the tower, and the old chronicler says that never again did he look the man he was before.

Such patriots had our country of old, and we stand here to-day the lineal descendants of such men and many another. We are the true daughters of the Revolution, who believe to-day as our forefathers believed, and as they fought and died to prove, that taxation without representation is unjust. [Applause.]

Miss ANTHONY. The next in order will be Mrs. Lucretia L. Blankenburg, daughter of Dr. Hannah Longshore, who was the first woman that was graduated as a physician in Philadelphia. Mrs. Blankenburg is the president of the State society of Pennsylvania.

STATEMENT OF MRS. LUCRETIA L. BLANKENBURG.

Mrs. BLANKENBURG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my theme to-day will be the home. I am a home maker. All through song and story we read of woman as the queen of the home, where she reigns supreme. Now, in fact, she is the sharer of the home. Therefore politics enters the home. It enters through the water department, and the more corrupt the politics the dirtier the water. [Laughter.] I live in Philadelphia, gentlemen, and I am very familiar with the subject. Politics enters the home through the gas pipes and along the electric wires. It also enters the home through the doors and windows, in the form of dust. The poor asphalt pavements that we have are very manifest, as are also the neglected streets.

Municipal housekeeping is simply homekeeping on a larger scale. Men do not make a special study of housekeeping, yet it is our experience that men are elected to take charge of a whole city of homes. Now, what we wish to do is to take the home into politics. The ward in which I live in the city of Philadelphia is in the center of the city, and to find out how many of our own members are interested in taking the home into politics we have made a house-to-house canvass. We have a population of about 20,000 inhabitants in that ward, and a very remarkable fact in our locality is that we have more men than women; and at the last election in November more than half of the male population in our ward voted!

We visited 1,227 homes of women in this ward and interviewed them, and we found a great many, of course, that have no opinions on these subjects, and we found some that did not care to express their opinion, for, they said to the canvasser, "We belong to the gang and we are not going to talk to you on this subject." Then we had others that had never thought about it and were not interested, but over 50 per cent of these women were interested in the politics that come into their homes, and most of them who expressed an opinion said they thought women should serve on the school boards and on the health boards.

We hope to follow this matter up and hold meetings from time to time in this ward, and educate these women to help make our city a cleaner and better place in which to live.

Now, gentlemen, we not only want to take the home into the city politics, but we want to take it into the State and national assemblies. This would not be a strange precedent. I read the other day in Gurden's Antiquities of Parliament that during the reign of Edward III no less than ten women had writs served upon them to serve as members of the Parliament. They were peeresses, and I suppose received this honor on account of their birth. But we are all peeresses in America, and we are ready and anxious to sit in the parliament of the nation. [Applause.]

Miss ANTHONY. I now introduce Rev. Olympia Brown, a regularly ordained minister, and president of the Wisconsin State society.

STATEMENT OF REV. OLYMPIA BROWN.

Rev. OLYMPIA BROWN. Gentlemen of the committee, I do not come to make any special plea in behalf of women or to ask any particular favors for them, nor even to speak of the awful iniquity and the gross

wickedness of making women pay the bills and submit to a government in which they have no voice; but I come rather to speak in the interest of the State itself, the rulers of the State, the men of the nation, and especially the Congressmen.

I ask your attention to the fact that in the consideration of any great subject it is not enough to take observations from a single point of view. You remember the story of the two knights who fought about the color of a shield, one saying it was red and the other that it was white. After they had fought about it for a long time, each looked on the other side and found that the shield was both white and red. Now, as I understand it, you gentlemen who are ruling the country are looking only on one side of the shield, and that is the red side. Will you not look upon the white side also? [Applause.] Will you not bring in testimony from both sides?

I am told that when our astronomers wish to determine the distance of any heavenly body, they take a great number of observations from a great number of points, and then they compare and collate, and the result of this comparison and collation gives them the true position of the subject which they are studying. Now, when you have before you any great question of importance, you need to take observations from different sides.

Woman has a different standpoint, a different point of view from that of man.

Even if we should admit, as some claim, that the masculine and the feminine souls, or brains, or minds, or spirits are all alike, nevertheless, the different experiences of life, the different positions they occupy, give them still a different point of view from that of men, and you want both points of view in order to get the whole well-rounded truth.

But women *are* different from men. As Mr. Finck well says, there is sex in mind. They approach every subject from a different side. They view it from a different standpoint, and in order to get the truth you must have woman's testimony as well as man's testimony. She must speak out of experience, out of the soul life which has been given to her, and that will be the necessary supplement to man's observation. Wise men tell us that woman is intuition and man is reason. Very good. Why not have both? A little intuition in our legislative bodies would save an immense amount of time and cut a vast deal of red tape, and I think we need it and I believe anyone thinks so who has ever had anything to do with any kind of legislative process.

We need both observations, and then, having the best thought of man, supplemented by the best thought of woman, we shall get the truth on the great subjects that are to be acted upon by our legislators.

You may say, perhaps, that you get woman's thought from her conversation and through her writing, but you do not. You can not get her thought in that way any more than you can breathe the morning air through two thicknesses of cheesecloth. You prefer to go out into the air and take it at first hand. Now, when you take a woman's opinion or her observation, percolating though pages of dusty print paper, or through the report of the men with whom she converses, you have not her opinion; you have only a dull, dim, blurred photograph of what her opinon is. You can only get her opinion when she gives it at first hand through the ballot.

The human being is twofold, masculine and feminine. The masculine

and the feminine together constitute the human being. The human brain is twofold, the masculine and the feminine. Most men realize this, and take to themselves the feminine heart, and so make themselves complete men. Why should Uncle Sam be the only fellow to go about doing his work with half a brain? [Laughter.] Why should he not be allowed the feminine half of the brain to help him to solve the questions and the problems of peace and war and finance with which he is confronted? We want all the intellect and all the reason and all the intuition that God has given us, to adjust the varied relations of the people in such a country as ours. With these varied peoples of all nationalities, how absurd it would be and how unjust it would be to suppose that the men in Maine, for instance, could understand and properly determine what should be the policy of this whole country.

What would South Carolina say to a proposition to leave all questions of government to the men of Maine. Or suppose on the other hand the men of South Carolina should be set up to determine the interests of Maine. Would they understand what the men of Maine want at all? No; because they have an entirely different point of view. So men can not understand women's point of view.

And then, again, we desire the ballot in the hands of women because we desire an entire reform in our suffrage laws, for the sake of the Congressmen of the country. We wish to help them all we can. Our Congressmen at present are placed in a very uncomfortable position. They desire to do their best for the people whom they represent. They must fulfill the wishes of their constituency. They must be responsible and answerable to that constituency.

Now, you do not stand on an equality, on a level plane, on the floor of Congress. A man from Iowa has behind him a constituency of male citizens—men who have lived in this country at least five years, consequently men who can read our language, men who probably own property and have real estate interests here, and when he has been elected by those citizens and has come to Congress, and has done his best in mind and thought to please them—when he goes home he meets the same men there. They live there; that is their home; they know what he has done; they voted for him before, and they have applauded his course. That man can stand up quite strongly on the floor of Congress; feeling that his action will be understood at home.

Take Wisconsin and some of the other Northwestern States. The Representative in Congress has behind him no such constituency as I have described, but he has behind him a voting population that may have landed in the State within the last year, or within the last six months, or in some of the States in the last four months. A large number of them can not speak the language. Very many of them know nothing of our institutions or our history. They have voted for this man because they have been following some leader, or been governed by some chance circumstance. They are not capable of following his acts in Congress; and when, at the end of his term of service, he comes back he finds strangers in their places. He does not meet the same men who voted for him, for they have gone on to make new homes in other places. He finds in their places a lot of people who do not know anything about him. He is not on an equality with the man from Iowa. We ask you to make these Congressmen equal, by giving us some kind of a uniform suffrage law, whereby all the citizens, and

only the citizens of the United States will have an equal right of suffrage everywhere. [Applause.]

Miss ANTHONY. Mrs. Mariana W. Chapman, president of the New York State society, will now address the committee.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MARIANA W. CHAPMAN.

Mrs. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we come to you asking for a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbidding disfranchisement by the States on account of sex, because we believe it to be a part of the grounds of justice on which this Government was established. On the top of the Dome of this great Capitol is the figure of a woman as the emblem of freedom in this so-called Republic. Is it consistent, when a woman is the only permanently disfranchised citizen of the country?

Even criminals, if they be men, may assume the prerogative of the franchise so soon as they are out of the penitentiaries. Lunatics, if men, may recover their reason and do likewise. Paupers, if men, are released from the almshouses a few days before election and present themselves at the polls. Aliens, if men, which they are in a larger proportion, may overcome their exclusion by varying periods of residence in the different States. Minors, if boys, will vote at twenty-one, but their mothers are minors forever in the eyes of the law. They are legislated for and governed and, to some extent, protected.

We acknowledge the chivalry of this, but we ask for something more precious—the jewel of justice. We ask for it because we are individual human beings who average well with men in intelligence, in virtue, and in sobriety. We ask for it as taxpayers, because we help to maintain the expense of this great Capitol and other buildings, and to pay the salaries of those who serve in them. We desire it for our own protection just as men desire it for theirs. We ask it because we are the only civilized country in the world which makes its women subjects of foreign men, educated and uneducated, of the negro, and the American Indians. We ask it because, except in four States, we are the only Anglo-Saxon country where women have so low a political status.

In England and all her colonies women have all but the Parliamentary vote. Shall the men of the United States be less generous? We ask this Congress to make itself historic by asserting that the Declaration of Independence refers to all rational human beings as the possessors of the inalienable rights there affirmed. [Applause.]

Miss ANTHONY. The next speaker will be Miss Gail Laughlin, who will speak of this matter as it affects the wage-earner.

Miss Laughlin is a graduate of Wellesley College and of the Cornell University Law School, so that she is competent to speak on this question. [Applause.]

STATEMENT OF MISS GAIL LAUGHLIN.

Miss LAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, within the last few years the United States has taken its place among the nations of the earth as one of the great world powers. The countries of Europe which a century ago viewed with contemptuous

scorn the new nation for which they predicted but a short life are now rivals for our friendship, and considerable space in their newspapers is at the present time devoted to setting forth their respective claims upon us for favorable consideration. The immediate cause of this is to be found in our economic importance. Political power has always been the outgrowth of economic strength, as the history of the world shows. It is of primary, it is of paramount importance that the nation should be economically strong, and the nation will be economically strong just in proportion as its people are intelligent, developed, and efficient. Whatever therefore brings about the best development of the people and makes them most intelligent and efficient promotes most the economic strength of the country and therefore adds most to its power and importance among the nations of the world.

There is no one force, there is no combination of forces so potent in the development of the people as is individual liberty. We have learned this as a nation, and we are beginning to teach it to the world. There is no workman on the face of the earth so efficient as is the American workman. Manufacturer after manufacturer testified to this fact before the United States Industrial Commission. One witness before the Commission, Mr. Jacob Weidmann, a silk manufacturer of Paterson, N. J., who has been an employer of labor both in this country and abroad, stated not only that the workmen in the silk mills in this country are more efficient than those across the water, but went so far as to say that foreign workmen coming to this country become in the course of time wholly different men and fully a third more efficient. Why is this so? Why, except that the workman feels in this country the vivifying influence of liberty? His ambition is stimulated by the greater opportunities which are opened up to him, and is reinforced by the self-respect which grows out of the knowledge that here he may become a sovereign citizen—an equal ruler with other sovereign citizens. In his own hands, through his possession of the right of suffrage, lies the power of control over the conditions which affect him. Not only does this fact make more of a man of him by inspiring him with confidence and hope and with a sense of power, but it has a practical and immediate value as well, in that it enables him directly to resist oppression and injustice.

"Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men," says the Declaration of Independence. Life itself is wrapped up in the possession of industrial opportunity. "Earning a living" is the short and familiar phrase for economic activity. To secure just and equitable industrial conditions then is one of the primary functions of government. That just and equitable conditions may be secured for any individual or class of individuals, that individual or class of individuals must have a share in the government whose function it is to secure these rights.

That the share in the government possessed by the workmen of the country is no empty, is conclusively evidenced by the mass of labor legislation which has been enacted in recent years. There is no need, though, to use up time in proving that the right of suffrage is the most valuable possession of the workingman and the only guaranty of his liberty. But there are working women as well as working men, women who stand side by side with the men in our shops and factories, doing similar work for the same employers, and under similar conditions.

There were in 1890, according to the census of that year, 3,914,571

women engaged in labor other than that of their own households, 2,611,843 of them being engaged in other than domestic service. Unfortunately the figures for the census of 1900 are not yet available. Such advance bulletins as have been issued, however, show an increase in the number of women wage-earners. At the same ratio of increase in the decade from 1890 to 1900 as is shown in the decade from 1880 to 1890 the number of women engaged in wage-paid occupations would be 5,789,650 and the number engaged in occupations other than that of domestic service would be 4,069,251. Such an army of women constitutes an important factor in the industrial life of the country. That it should be the most efficient factor possible is of vital importance. To women, as to men, the fullest individual liberty will be productive of the greatest development, and therefore of the greatest efficiency. Not only is it their inalienable right as individuals, as shareholders equally with men in this Government of the people, to be given the fullest opportunity for development, but by giving to them the fullest opportunity for development the country as a whole will gain in strength.

This is the country's side of it; then there is the man's side of it. The woman worker is deprived of the protection which the ballot would give to her. She can therefore be the more easily bullied, can be forced to accept conditions and wages which could never be forced on man. Since she is man's competitor, she is a factor in dragging him down to her lower standard. He suffers through her, and it is for his interest that woman should be made equally strong with him to resist industrial oppression.

Then there is the woman's side of it. The power of self-defense which is wrapped up in the ballot is her right as well as that of man, and her need for it is equally great. In the industrial world as nowhere else men and women meet simply as human beings. Sex has no place. There are no separate functions, no family ties to complicate the situation. The labor performed is exactly similar in character. There there is no possible opportunity for the claim that a woman's interests are protected by her husband, her father, her son, or her brother. The men with whom she works side by side are her rivals and competitors, each looking for every chance to get an advantage over his neighbor.

If woman is to be protected at all she must protect herself. She can not protect herself while the man by her side competing with her possesses a power by which he may determine the conditions under which both he and she may work, possesses the power to make conditions less favorable for her than for himself, and thus obtain for himself an unfair advantage over her. This, however, is the situation to-day. Men, through their right of suffrage and their consequent power over legislation, have the power to handicap their women competitors. Already there has been some discriminating legislation, some restriction on the hours and occupations of women which do not apply to men, and there are not lacking propositions on the part of labor leaders and others to restrict further the economic activity of women. Some of the restrictions made may be for the benefit of women workers, but women should be the ones to decide what is for their benefit rather than to have it decided for them by their business rivals, whose advantage it is to further their own interests.

If men and women stood on an equality industrially in all other

respects, women would need the right of suffrage in common with men in order to protect that equality. And they do not stand on an equality. Without considering whether or not the original cause of their unequal position is due to their inferior political position, the fact remains that inequality exists and that women in industrial life are at a serious disadvantage as compared with men. The restrictions on their movements which tradition and prejudice have imposed have made it less easy for them to move about in search of new occupations and wider opportunities. Their wages average only 40 per cent of the average wages paid to men. The report of the Senate Committee on Finance on prices, wages, and transportation, published some ten years ago, showed the average rate of men's wages in this country in the industries enumerated to be $2.17 per day; the special report of the National Department of Labor published in 1889, showed the average wages of working women in twenty-two principal cities of the country to be 87 cents per day. In part this difference between the wages of men and women is due to the fact that the more important positions are given to men. In part it is due to the fact that for exactly similar work, women receive only a fractional part of the wages paid to men. Whichever cause operates in any particular case, the fact remains unaltered that the woman is at a disadvantage.

Not only is this true in purely business occupations, but it is equally true in respect to public positions. In Massachusetts the salaries of the women school-teachers average only one-third of the salaries of the men teachers. The school law in the State of New York, where the amount of salary is graded according to length of service, and where retention in office depends on efficiency, discriminates between men and women in favor of men in respect to salaries.

It is true that the wage rate paid in business occupations can not be directly affected by legislation. The salaries paid to those holding public positions, however, are directly under the control of the voting population, and the equalizing of the salaries of men and women teachers in the public schools and of men and women employed in any public position could be accomplished directly through legislation. In fact, this is what has been done in the State of Wyoming, where men and women share equally in the government. The equalizing of conditions for men and women in the schools and in other public positions would affect wages and conditions in other occupations, even as the shortening of the hours and the raising of the wages of men employed on public works, which has been done in some States, has already had an effect on hours and wages in private enterprises.

There is more than a personal question involved in this question of wages for women, more than a mere economic question. There is a moral question, for in too many cases the wages of women are depressed below the cost of living, and there are presented to women the alternatives of starvation or immorality. The New York bureau of labor in 1885, and again in 1895, when investigations were made, found large numbers of women obliged to work nineteen hours a day in order to earn 25 cents. In view of the existence of such conditions, it is not strange that vice flourishes. Here again, then, the community as a whole is as vitally concerned in the economic elevation of women as are the women themselves.

Weighed down in the beginning by their lower wages and by the greater tendency on the part of their employers to take advantage of

them, women are placed at further disadvantage in comparison with the men with whom they must compete, by their utter inability to affect industrial conditions through the exercise of the right of suffrage. It is a handicap race, but one conducted contrary to all rules, for the handicap is placed on the competitor who is already at a disadvantage. In asking for the removal of the handicap of disfranchisement from women we are not asking for them an advantage over men to compensate for the disadvantage from which women suffer because of the inferior position given to them and the extra burdens laid upon them in the past, but are asking simply for a fair field and no favors.

There has been in some quarters a disposition to regard the presence of women in industrial life as an abnormal condition of affairs, and therefore as something to be discouraged by all means possible. This opinion is the opinion of those who look at the question only superficially, those who fail to appreciate economic history, and fail to comprehend the working of economic laws and to understand the changes in industrial conditions which have taken place during the last half century. The industrial history of the last half century is not a history of the increased employment of women. It is simply a history of industrial readjustment. Women have always been workers, but changes have taken place in the conditions under which they work.

Before the development of the factory system much of the work now done in the factories was performed in the home and by women.

This is especially true of spinning, carding, weaving, and of all labor entering into the manufacture of textiles. While it is true that large numbers of women are employed in textile mills, it is true also that large numbers of men are employed in those mills, and are thus employed in the performance of labor formerly performed by women. What is true of textile manufacture is, in a less degree, true of many other occupations, as laundry work, the canning of fruit, the making of butter and cheese, etc.

The specialization of labor, which has taken work from the home to the factory, has brought about a readjustment of the labor of both men and women. The transfer of the work and the substitution of the labor of men for that of women has deprived many women of employment which they formerly found within the home, and has forced them to look outside and find occupation wherever there may be opportunity. Many of them have found employment directly in the occupations taken from home to factory, but there has not been room for all in these occupations, inasmuch as much of the labor is now being performed by men, and consequently many others have been forced to look for employment in occupations from which there have been withdrawn the men who are now employed in occupations formerly monopolized by women.

Again, industrial changes have created many new occupations, such as stenography and typewriting, in which large numbers of women have found employment, and in which there has been no displacement of either men or women.

It can not he said, therefore, that women are taking men's work from them or that they are displacing men in the sense that more women and fewer men are being actually employed in labor.*

The change lies in the facts that an increasing number of women are doing their work in factories and that they are being paid a definite money wage for their work instead of being obliged to be dependent for compensation on the caprice of the head of the household within which their work may lie.

The idea is held more or less broadly in this country that the ideal condition for women is that of leisure. This ideal is both modern and artificial. Women have always been factors in the world's work, and in the past were so recognized. The Statutes of Laborers enacted

*Taken from article on "Labor of Women," for the Industrial Commission by Miss Laughlin and embodied in their reports.

in Edward III's time exacted service from men and women alike. The Statute of Apprenticeship authorized magistrates to seize upon any woman between 14 and 40 years of age who was unmarried and out of service and set her to work "for such wages and in such reasonable sort or manner as they shall think fit." The false modern ideal has been produced by the changed conditions which make it necessary for a large proportion of women workers to find their work outside the home. Because the activities of women have been confined to the home in the past the scope and value of their work have not been recognized. The world, however, could not have done without their labor and it can not do without it now. No nation can be strong and support a large leisure class, whether that class consist of men or women. There is not such a surplus of force and ability in the world that we can afford to waste one-half of the available supply. The world needs the work of women for its development. Women need work for their own development. The active, intelligent, capable women of this country will never accept either as a fact or as an ideal an aimless, occupationless life, which would mean the dissipation of their energies, the dwarfing of their abilities, and the limitation of their possibilities. Women will continue to be workers in the future as they have been workers in the past. There will be no going back from the factory system, no retransfer of industry from factory to home. Women therefore in order to do their share of the world's work in the future must in large numbers find occupation outside the home. The woman wage-earner has come to stay. The existence of a large body of wage-earning women is a normal, therefore a permanent feature of our industrial life and one which must be reckoned within the shaping of national policies. All that they ask is an opportunity equal to that of their brothers to do good, honest work in the world, an equal opportunity to make the most of the abilities which God has given them with equal power to secure for themselves protection of their inalienable rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," to secure which rights is the fundamental object of government. [Applause.]

Miss ANTHONY. The next speaker will be Mrs. Jennie A. Brown, of Minneapolis, Minn.

STATEMENT OF MRS. JENNIE A. BROWN.

Mrs. BROWN. Just a word for the women of the Northwest, gentlemen: We, the women of the Northwest, the land of broad acres and prosperity, do not come to-day with a tale of wrongs to be righted. We are not a discontented, envious class of women, but when the governor of Colorado in his charge to the young women graduates of the Denver University told them, "You are now equally with your brothers qualified citizens of our great Republic. You receive the same privileges and upon your shoulders fall the same responsibilities, and you are in every respect as fully prepared to perform the duties, discharge the responsibilities in as creditable manner as they, your brother classmates"—might we be excused a feeling of jealousy, a twinge of envy, of those our fortunate sisters?

For, gentlemen, we are not in every respect citizens of this great Republic. As you very well know, our great Northwest is sprinkled

liberally with coeducational universities, where the young women of the day breathe the spirit of equality and comradeship, and it is only when they leave the protection of their alma mater where they have stood side by side with their brother students in the legal, the medical, and the literary classics, that the male students can say, "Now step aside; 'we are the people,' you are female."

For as scientists have discovered, the spiritual, the mental, the intellectual is superior to the distinction of sex. Therefore we come to you urging this very natural right which men are every day tacitly acknowledging—"the right of equal legalized recognition." We are not socialists; we have no anarchistic motives; but in our very climate we breathe the spirit of energy and courage, and many of us who would not start at the blood-curdling cry of the coyote tremble with nervous dread at the very thought of coming to the national capital and facing the Senatorial dignity of this gracious but august committee. True. As our French sister would say, "Voila." It is in the atmosphere and the training of the new century.

Some very astute observers from the European countries have remarked the great influence of the American woman with her husband and brothers. In no other land, say they, is the wife so much the companion, the adviser, the comrade, as in this great America. Our Austrian friends claim that the American women are weak, that they neglect the development of the muscular system. While in Austria the wife may as often beat her husband as he can beat her, in America the wife is in the power of the husband. In New Zealand the women are politically equal to the men, and in many European countries they seem to be ahead of us in a few particulars; yet in the main it is in America that the woman is accorded a high place socially, practically, and theoretically, and in no other country is the spirit of reform so favorable to the uplifting of women.

We, the American women of the Northwest, do not ask for the earth. We would not be modern Atlases. We only ask our share—only a legal claim to half; only share and share alike—the lesson our mothers taught us in infancy. Why unlearn in mature years the best of their teaching? And because we are the helpmates, the comrades, of our husbands and brothers, reading the same papers, listening to the same arguments, interested vitally in the same government, trained along the same lines, we to-day ask the equal share. We would like to vote on all these great absorbing questions upon which you, together with the Sioux Indian, are voting. Is it unreasonable? Is it unnatural?

You yourselves are partially responsible. The Goddess of Liberty is always a female figure. If this is not natural, if this is not seemly, then pull her down and erect in her place the Colossus of Rhodes and give him the American flag to hold.

I beg pardon, gentlemen. This is not a recommendation. I have not come to advise. I have only come to plead for that which the new woman, the young woman of the Northwest, would applaud you for giving. [Applause.]

Miss ANTHONY. The next in order will be Mrs. Mary Wood Swift. She was formerly the president of the State of California Suffrage Society, and she is now the president of the National Council of Women of California. Her husband was a former minister to Japan.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MARY WOOD SWIFT.

Mrs. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in all sincerity I thank you for this privilege of speech. Women can not stand still while the world goes on. To hold that the world is not moving ahead were absurd; hence we have the admitted fact that women must progress. Department stores have crowded out small stores in many cities and towns. The small storekeepers have vainly protested against this form of competition. You know as well as I know that these protests have not even made a dent in economic conditions. In no single instance have they checked the department-store combination. The department store, whatever the equities may be, has come to stay. It is one form of modern mercantile progress. The same progress in a large degree is seen in the vast aggregations of capital that control American manufacturing and transportation interests, that are reaching out in all directions, that aim to dominate the trade and commerce of the world.

I am not discussing the equities of this material progress, gentlemen; I simply call your attention to vital facts. It is true that the material progress of the nation is one source of our national pride. The complement of this material progress should be moral or political progress, involving proper privileges to women. There can not be even and symmetrical progress unless these privileges be granted. The law should recognize woman as a factor in the great progress problem. The law should recognize the fact that the woman of to-day is liberally educated, is abreast of the world on current topics, is honestly patriotic, and, given a fair chance, can assist in making a greater United States. Does any thinking person doubt for a single moment that the thousands and thousands of women educated in our universities, colleges, and similar institutions are unequal to the great responsibilities of active and representative citizenship? And does it not strike you, gentlemen, that the cohesive intellectual strength of these intelligent women should be at least measurably utilized in shaping the progress of the country?

You see and note and are influenced by progress in other directions. Why not see and note and be influenced by the progress of woman toward suffrage? Why not work for amendments to the law that will protect women in their property rights? Money quarrels are the basis of family discord. Most of these quarrels would not occur if the wife had the property rights to which she is justly entitled.

If I have presented my ideas in a homely way, if I have left the paths usually followed in a discussion of this kind, remember, gentlemen, that I am mindful of the constant drain on your time and attention and have tried to be brief and suggestive. We who are working for this cause ask that you, gentlemen, as lawmakers, carefully read the signs of the times and assist in promoting the progress for which we specially stand. Woman suffrage is one of the several forms of progress which are forcing themselves to the front and becoming national issues. One by one they defy evasion and in the end have to be met and decided.

I lay no claim to the gift of prophecy, but I do say that political convulsions of the future, possibly the very near future, will throw woman suffrage into such prominence that at least one of the great

political parties will find it expedient, if not absolutely necessary, to put a woman suffrage plank in its platform. The United States is moving swiftly forward in a political as well as material sense. Had any man five years ago predicted the national conditions of to-day, the war with Spain, and our annexation and expansion programme, he would have been laughed to scorn. Is it not possible, aye even probable, that the political changes of the next few years will be equally startling? Is it not possible that aside from its merits, on general principles, woman suffrage will be utilized by one or both of the parties in trimming the ship of state? [Applause.]

Miss ANTHONY. Next in order will be Mrs. Lucy Hobart Day, president of the Maine Woman Suffrage Association. She is the daughter of a Methodist minister, and I do not think she will preach anything but good gospel.

STATEMENT OF MRS. LUCY HOBART DAY.

Mrs. DAY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, a great reform never has spontaneous birth, but exists in embryo, often for years, waiting the fullness of time when it shall be born, and this is especially true of the reform under consideration at the present time. Such a movement as this requires and deserves the best and most earnest thought of its advocates, and in the promulgation of the theory of "equality for all and special privileges for none" it should be remembered that we are not advancing a new doctrine, but simply an old one revived, which formerly had a promoter in the person of Plato, the greatest philosopher of his time, who has left this maxim on record.

Neither a man as a man nor a woman as a woman has any special function in the administration of a State, but the gifts are equally diffused in the sexes.

If this be true, as we believe it is, it may be said that the nonrecognition of women in affairs of state is simply and purely an arbitrary distinction, which from time immemorial has been made by men against women, and is not founded either on justice or equity.

It may be untrue, but there seems to be a lurking suspicion in the minds of those who administer affairs of state that women would scarcely be satisfied with an equal participation, and that there is great danger of an endeavor to secure a trifle more than our proportionate share.

I believe I voice the sentiments of every person in the world who believes in equality of rights for men and women when I say that if such a suspicion exists it is utterly without foundation.

We hear a great deal in these days about the "iron hand in the velvet glove," and are frequently told by our would-be opposers that we rule now by our indirect influence—altogether ignoring the fact that this is not a question of anybody's ruling.

Instead, it is a question of sharing equally with men all the rights, privileges, and duties which they enjoy, while every one who considers the subject intelligently can but acknowledge that an influence which has no responsibility back of it is a dangerous element which needs to be carefully watched and guarded.

The gentleman who at a dinner party proposed the following toast: "To the ladies, once our superiors, now our equals," had small conception of the term superiority. If being superior means "taxation without representation," if it means that mothers are not coguardians

their own children; that their property and personal rights are disgarded; that they are classed with paupers, idiots, and lunatics, then e are perfectly willing, aye, desirous of relinquishing all claims to uperiority, and taking our chances on terms of equality.

We are fully alive to the fact that every reform in past centuries has witnessed a struggle between opposing parties, and it has even been said that "Christianity has progressed from stake to stake, from guillotine to guillotine," but in every age there have been those who have fearlessly stood for truth and right regardless of consequences to themselves.

If I were an adept in the science of palmistry I would read the past, present, and future of this hand of woman's progress something after this fashion:

Its general appearance has ever been indicative of strength of character and purity of purpose.

Its headline has been as strong and vigorous as the minds of the many famous men who have fearlessly espoused the cause of the oppressed.

Its heart line has been and is as true and pure as the lives and hearts of the devoted army of women which has led and is still leading us to victory.

Its fate line, straight as the line of duty, constantly points toward the desired goal, while its life line, a curving line of beauty yet unbroken, will not be ended until the women of these United States have had placed in their hands that sacred token of citizenship, the ballot.

Miss ANTHONY. Next in order will be Miss Alice Stone Blackwell, daughter of Lucy Stone and Henry B. Blackwell, editor of the Woman's Journal.

STATEMENT OF MISS ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Miss BLACKWELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to submit to you to-day a few remarks, in very brief compass, simply from the standpoint of common sense.

I wish to recall to your memory the fact that every step of progress toward improvement in the condition of women has been opposed by exactly the same predictions of disaster as are now made in regard to equal suffrage. When my mother was trying to secure for married women the right to control their own property it was said that it would entirely destroy the home.

When school suffrage was granted to women in my own State, some twenty years ago, one of our State senators, Senator Winne, of Franklin, said in his address: "If we make this experiment we shall destroy the race, which will be blasted by the vengeance of Almighty God." That was twenty years ago. Since then half the States in the Union have granted the school franchise to women, and the vengeance of the Deity has not descended upon us in any appreciable manner.

When Vassar College was opened, a woman, who was the head of a band of missionaries going out to the Holy Land, said one thing she was sure of, that no refined Christian mother would ever send her daughter to Vassar College; that the mere fact that it was called a college for women was enough to condemn it. The popular belief was that it would surely be the destruction of the home.

These reiterated predictions of disaster that never materialize suggest the story of a very valuable mare which only had one fault. She would always shy at an open umbrella. Her owner undertook to cure her. She was very fond of raw potatoes, and he put a raw potato on the end of an umbrella which was tightly furled, took it into her stable, and gave her the potato off the tip of the umbrella. The next day he took another, and opened the umbrella an inch. The next day he opened it a little farther, and the next day a little farther, until it was wide open. The first time that he took the umbrella into the stall wide open the mare looked at it rather suspiciously for a moment, but ended by eating the potato off the tip of it, as usual. The next rainy day he took her out, and when they met an umbrella he waited to see what she would do. Instead of shying, she walked deliberately across the street toward the umbrella, and looked for a potato on the tip of it. She got one when she reached home, and she never shied at an umbrella again.

Now, the gradual broadening of woman's sphere has been just like the gradual opening of that umbrella. Every successive widening of it has proved to be entirely without danger, and has always been followed by something good. The only question is, How long will it take us to develop enough "horse sense" to see that the unfolding of the last inch is not going to do any harm?

Gentlemen of the committee, every one of you, and probably every member of Congress, has received or will receive from my State a document published by a little knot of ladies who oppose equal suffrage, setting forth their arguments against it. I will not take your time longer, inasmuch as we have our foreign delegates here, whom I know you are desirous to hear, but I will ask permission to print a condensed statement of the arguments on the other side, which we have prepared in reply. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Ordinarily we do not print anything in the Senate which is not read, but we will make an exception in this case.

The document is as follows:

PROGRESS OF EQUAL SUFFRAGE.

The annual Remonstrance, just issued by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, says: "With the growth of civilization women's political power has diminished." On this point let the facts speak for themselves.

Seventy years ago women could not vote anywhere. In 1838 Kentucky gave school suffrage to widows. In 1850 Ontario gave it to women both married and single. In 1861 Kansas gave it to all women. In 1867 New South Wales gave women municipal suffrage. In 1869 England gave municipal suffrage to single women and widows, Victoria gave it to women both married and single, and Wyoming gave full suffrage to all women.

In 1871 West Australia gave municipal suffrage to women. School suffrage was granted in 1875 by Michigan and Minnesota, in 1876 by Colorado, in 1877 by New Zealand, in 1878 by New Hampshire and Oregon, in 1879 by Massachusetts, in 1880 by New York and Vermont. In 1880 South Australia gave municipal suffrage to women.

In 1881 municipal suffrage was extended to the single women and widows of Scotland. Nebraska gave women school suffrage in 1883,

Ontario and Tasmania gave them municipal suffrage in 1884, and Wisconsin gave them school suffrage in 1885. In 1886 municipal suffrage was given in New Zealand and New Brunswick.

In 1887 municipal suffrage was granted in Kansas, Nova Scotia, and Manitoba, and school suffrage in North and South Dakota, Montana, Arizona, and New Jersey. In the same year Montana gave taxpaying women the right to vote upon all questions submitted to the taxpayers.

In 1888 England gave women county suffrage and British Columbia and the Northwest Territory gave them municipal suffrage. In 1889 county suffrage was given to the women of Scotland and municipal suffrage to single women and widows in the Province of Quebec. In 1891 school suffrage was granted in Illinois. In 1893 school suffrage was granted in Connecticut and full suffrage in Colorado and New Zealand. In 1894 school suffrage was granted in Ohio, bond suffrage in Iowa, and parish and district suffrage in England to women both married and single. In 1895 full suffrage was granted in South Australia to women both married and single. In 1896 full suffrage was granted in Utah and Idaho.

In 1898 the women of Ireland were given the right to vote for all officers except members of Parliament, Minnesota gave women the right to vote for library trustees, Delaware gave school suffrage to taxpaying women, French women engaged in commerce were given the right to vote for judges of the tribunals of commerce, and Louisiana gave taxpaying women the right to vote upon all questions submitted to the taxpayers. In 1900 West Australia granted full Parliamentary suffrage to women both married and single.

In 1901 New York gave taxpaying women the right to vote on questions of local taxation, and Norway gave them municipal suffrage.

Years ago, when equal suffrage was much more unpopular than it is now, somebody asked Bishop Gilbert Haven if it were true that he had been speaking at a suffrage meeting.

"Yes," answered the Bishop. "I don't want to fall in at the rear of this reform; I mean to march with the procession."

There can be no doubt as to which way the procession is moving.

THE M. A. O. F. E. S. W.

The Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women claims to have 9,865 members in 191 cities and towns. This statement gives a greatly exaggerated idea of its strength, when unaccompanied with an explanation as to what constitutes membership. In most societies those who join pay a membership fee and renew their membership from year to year. Those who join the M. A. O. F. E. S. W. pay no membership fee; they merely sign an anti-suffrage document, in many cases only a return postal card; and the woman who wrote down her name seven years ago and has never given any sign of interest since is still counted as a "member" to-day.

As Mrs. Livermore has pointed out, those women who join the M. A. O. F. E. S. W. show the same amount of interest as those who sign a suffrage petition; no more, no less. If all the women in Massachusetts who have ever signed a petition for suffrage were counted as members of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, it would count at least 100,000 members.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN ENGLAND.

Mr. I. N. Ford is quoted in the Remonstrance as saying that in England, for many years past, "public interest in the political enfranchisement of women has steadily declined."

The first petition for woman suffrage presented to Parliament, in 1867, was signed by only 1,449 women. The petition of 1873 was signed by 11,000 women. The petition presented to the members of the recent Parliament was signed by 257,000 women.

THE CASE OF KANSAS.

The Remonstrance intimates that municipal woman suffrage in Kansas must be a failure because a constitutional amendment to grant women full suffrage was voted down. The Georgia legislature has just voted down a bill to admit women to the State university. Does it follow that girls have not done well as students in the grammar and high schools of Georgia?

Suppose the Georgia legislature had just voted down, unanimously and with ridicule, a bill to exclude girls from the high schools; should we nevertheless be justified in insisting that girls must have proved failures in the high schools because the legislature refuses as yet to admit them to the university? After fourteen years' experience of municipal woman suffrage, the last Kansas legislature voted down, almost unanimously, and amid "a ripple of amusement," a bill to repeal it.

An amendment to grant women full suffrage has been twice submitted in Kansas. It was first submitted some years before women obtained municipal suffrage, and it then received only 9,100 votes. It was submitted again after seven years' experience of municipal suffrage, and it received 95,302 votes.

Somebody says few women would vote if enfranchised. Well, it often happens in an election that more than half the men refuse to vote. But if one man or woman wants to exercise the right to vote, what earthly reason is there for denying it because other men and women do not wish to exercise it? If I desire to breathe the fresh air of heaven, shall I not cross my threshold because the rest of the family group prefer the stale atmosphere indoors?—*Secretary of the Navy Long.*

"THE INDIFFERENCE OF WOMEN."

It is often said that whenever the majority of women ask for suffrage they will get it. But it is a simple historical fact that every improvement thus far made in the condition of women has been secured, not by a general demand from the majority of women, but by the arguments, entreaties, and "continual coming" of a persistent few. In each case the advocates of progress have had to contend not merely with the conservatism of men, but with the indifference of women, and often with active opposition from some of them.

When a man in Saco, Me., first employed a saleswoman the men boycotted his store, and the women remonstrated earnestly with him on the sin of which he was guilty in placing a young woman in a position of such publicity. When Lucy Stone began to try to secure for married women the right to their own property women asked, with scorn, "Do you think I would give myself where I would not give my property?" When Elizabeth Blackwell began to study medicine the women at her boarding house refused to speak to her, and women passing her on the streets held their skirts aside, so as not to touch her.

It is a matter of history with what ridicule and opposition Mary Lyon's first efforts for the education of women were received, not only by the mass of men, but by the mass of women as well. In England, when the Oxford examinations were thrown open to women, the Dean of Chichester preached a sermon against it, in which he said: "By the sex at large, certainly, the new curriculum is not asked for. I have ascertained, by extended inquiry among gentlewomen, that with true feminine instinct they either entirely distrust or else look with downright disfavor on so wild an innovation and interference with the best traditions of their sex."

In Eastern countries, where women are shut up in zenanas and forbidden to walk the streets unveiled, the women themselves are among the strongest upholders of these traditional restrictions, which they have been taught to think add to their dignity. The Chinese lady is as proud of her small feet as any American "anti" is of her political disabilities. Ramabai tells us that the idea of education for girls is so unpopular with the mass of Hindoo women that when a progressive Hindoo proposes to educate his little daughter it is not uncommon for the women of his family to threaten to drown themselves.

All this merely shows that human nature is conservative, and that it is fully as conservative in women as in men. The persons much interested in any reform are always comparatively few, whether among men or women, and they are habitually regarded with disfavor, even by those whom the proposed reform is to benefit. Thomas Hughes says, in Tom Brown at Rugby: "So it is and must be always, my dear boys. If the Angel Gabriel were to come down from heaven and head a successful rise against the most abominable and unrighteous vested interest which this poor old world groans under, he would most certainly lose his character for many years, probably for centuries, not only with the upholders of the said vested interest, but with the respectable mass of the people whom he had delivered."

Women as a sex are not belligerent, and under whatever conditions of injustice or hardship they have been placed, the majority of them have never protested. Prof. James Bryce says, in "Transcaucasia and Ararat:"

> Nothing strikes a Westerner with more disgust than the way he sees women treated in Mohammedan countries. It is not so much the enforced seclusion that revolts you as the tacit assumption that women are inferior creatures altogether, unfit to be companions for man, but rather to be reckoned a link between him and the brutes, and treated with little more regard than the latter. That they acquiesce uncomplainingly in this view, and assert their power in hidden and crooked ways, does not make the sight less offensive or the results less mischievous.

Many changes for the better have been made during the last half century in the laws, written and unwritten, relating to women. Everybody approves of these changes now, because they have become accomplished facts. But not one of them would have been made to this day

if it had been necessary to wait till the majority of women asked for it. The change now under discussion is to be judged on its merits. In the light of history, the indifference of most women and the opposition of a few must be taken as a matter of course. It has no more rational significance now than it has had in regard to each previous step of women's progress.

TAXATION AND THE BALLOT.

The Remonstrance declares that the payment of taxes has no bearing upon the right to vote. United States Senator Hoar has well said:

> We have driven our leading opponents from one position to another, until there is not a thoughtful opponent of woman suffrage to be found who is not obliged to deny the doctrine which is affirmed in our Declaration of Independence.

Last year the New York legislature gave tax-paying women in all the towns and villages throughout the State the right to vote upon questions of local taxation. This bill had passed the popular branch of several successive legislatures by heavy majorities—one year unanimously—before it succeeded in getting through the senate. When it finally became a law, the fact was hailed with gratification even by newspapers that had always been opposed to equal suffrage. The Chicago Evening Post voiced a very general sentiment when it said:

> The question of letting all women vote on all questions may be debatable; but the question of letting all taxpayers vote for all officers concerned in taxation hardly seems to have two sides.

Even the New York Times said that the passage of the bill was "not so much a victory for woman suffrage as the perfecting of women's property rights."

The New York Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women, which fought this bill with all its might, is now largely reconciled to it, and says in its recent annual report:

> As the months have slipped by we have come to feel that in neither house was the bill considered as a suffrage measure, any more than the married women's property bill.

Last year, at the legislative hearing at Albany on this bill, the spokeswoman of the "antis" said she had ascertained, by extended inquiry, that hardly any women favored taxpayers' suffrage except those who favored general suffrage for all women. At a meeting held a few weeks ago in Buffalo, the chairman of the New York State Anti-Suffrage Association, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, was reported in the papers as saying that about half the members of the "Anti" Association now believe in suffrage for taxpaying women. In other words, within less than a year after taxpayers' suffrage became an accomplished fact in New York, its satisfactory working has converted half of the very women who were most intensely opposed to it beforehand.

ANARCHY, SOCIALISM, AND SUFFRAGE.

The members of the Massachusetts legislature have received from Chicago a quantity of documents aiming to persuade them that Massachusetts women ought not to be allowed to vote. The most consider-

able pamphlet is by Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin, of Chicago, who says in substance that anarchism, socialism, woman suffrage, and the abolition of marriage are all practically one and the same thing. In proof of this she refers to the excesses of the French Revolution, and says:

> The French Revolution, as everybody knows, proclaimed the abolition of marriage, and put men and women on a so-called equal basis as regarded political rights. Women were to enjoy equal rights as to suffrage and political emoluments.

The French Revolution, as everybody knows who knows anything about history, did nothing of the kind. When Paris was ringing with the cry of "Liberty, equality, and fraternity!" a deputation of women came before the Assembly and asked that their equal rights also might be recognized in the new order of things. The blood-stained revolutionary leaders ordered them back to their kitchens, with a lecture on woman's sphere that might have emanated direct from the Anti-Suffrage Association. Rousseau, who, as Mrs. Corbin mentions, sent his children to the Foundling Asylum, held views on the woman question almost identical with those of Mr. Henry T. Finck. Among the prominent French revolutionists, Condorcet was almost the only one who believed in equal political rights for women. Since the French Revolution gave suffrage to men and denied it to women, and since Mrs. Corbin wishes to give suffrage to men and deny it to women, Mrs. Corbin probably believes in the abolition of marriage and of religion, and would inaugurate a reign of the guillotine if she could. At least this is the basis on which she argues about the suffragists.

Mrs. Corbin intimates that the second French Revolution of 1848 was another woman's rights outbreak. But the second French Republic did not give the ballot to women any more than the first. Madame de Girardin wrote in 1848:

> A loyal republic is the dream of all generous and independent minds. But alas, those who have proclaimed it do not understand it. The proof that they do not understand the republic is that in their fine promises of universal enfranchisement they have forgotten woman. The stableman a voter! And the author of Consuelo and so many chefs d'œuvre, George Sand—O deputies too proud of your masculine obscurity! George Sand has not the right to trace on a ballot with her immortal pen a single one of your unknown names.

The excesses of the French Revolution are often quoted in Europe as an argument against a republican form of government for men, but it is hard to see how they constitute an argument against the ballot for women.

Mrs. Corbin is as imperfectly informed upon philosophy as upon history. She declares anarchism to be "a phase of socialism." Socialism and anarchism represent opposite extremes. The anarchist thinks that government should be abolished; the socialist, that the powers and scope of government should be vastly extended. No anarchist believes in suffrage for anybody; hence no anarchist believes in suffrage for women. The essence of anarchistic doctrine is that there should be no government and no voting. Not long before President McKinley's assassination, at a meeting where Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, the president of the National Suffrage Association, had spoken, Emma Goldman rose in the audience at the close of her address, and denounced her for her folly in seeking the ballot for women. Emma Goldman does not believe in woman suffrage, and Mrs. Corbin does not believe in woman suffrage. Does it follow that Mrs. Corbin is an anarchist?

The Empress of China has just issued an edict to permit the unbinding of women's feet. The advocates of equal suffrage also favor the unbinding of women's feet. Does it follow that the suffragists must be Boxers in disguise?

Theodore Roosevelt recommended woman suffrage in his inaugural message to the New York legislature. Are we to assume that Mr. Roosevelt is an anarchist?

Mrs. Corbin quotes arguments in favor of the abolition of marriage from a number of European socialistic writers, most of whom the majority of Americans never heard of. No doubt some European socialists hold queer and objectionable views on the marriage question. Does it follow that Mrs. Julia Ward Howe and Mrs. Mary A. Livermore wish to "emancipate women from the bonds of purity by bringing them down to the level of promiscuity," or that American women, if they had the ballot, would vote to abolish marriage? The insinuation is not only absurd, but monstrous.

The first woman in America to ask for a vote was Mrs. Margaret Brent, of Maryland, a kinswoman of Lord Baltimore, in 1647, more than a century before the French Revolution. The next was Abigail Adams, of Massachusetts, an irreproachable wife and mother, who wrote to her husband, John Adams, in 1776:

> I long to hear that you have declared an independency. And in the new code of laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make, I desire that you would remember the ladies, and be more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors. We will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we have no voice or representation.

THE FAMILY UNINJURED.

Equal suffrage does not injure the family. In Wyoming full suffrage was granted to women in 1869. During the twenty years from 1870 to 1890 divorce in the United States at large increased about three times as fast as the population. In the group of Western States, omitting Wyoming, it increased nearly four times as fast as the population. In Wyoming it increased only about half as fast as the population.

"An ounce of fact is worth a ton of theory."

"THE RIGHTS OF THE MAJORITY."

The small number of women who protest against suffrage claim to represent "the overwhelming majority of their sex." This is totally untrue. The majority of women are neither suffragists nor remonstrants; they are indifferent. Of those who take any lively interest in the question either way, the great majority are in favor. This has been shown conclusively wherever the matter has been brought to a test.

In Massachusetts, New York, Maine, Iowa—in short, wherever during the last twenty-five years petitions for suffrage and remonstrances

against it have been sent in, the petitioners have always outnumbered the remonstrants at least 5 to 1, and oftener 50 or 100 to 1. The so-called referendum in Massachusetts merely demonstrated the same thing by an official count.

The Remonstrance says that on the referendum out of 608,500 women who might have voted yes, "only 22,204 did so." But, on the other hand, out of 608,500 who might have voted no, only 864 did so. The antis invoke "the time-honored American principle that the will of the majority should govern." The American principle is that the majority of those who care enough about a question to express themselves should govern. The indifferent are not counted on either side. According to the women's vote, every county and every representative, Congressional, and senatorial district in Massachusetts went for equal suffrage by an average majority of 25 to 1.

It is remarkable that 22,204 women in Massachusetts should have taken the trouble to cast a mere mock vote, which was to have no legal validity, and was to give the women nothing if it went in their favor. On that occasion 22,204 women were found in one day who cared enough about suffrage to go to the polls and cast a vote for it. In seven years of diligent effort the Antisuffrage Association has found less than 10,000 who care enough about opposing it to sign their names on a return postal card.

The majority of women are indifferent on the question, a minority are strongly in favor of suffrage, and a much smaller minority are strongly opposed to it. That is the situation in a nutshell.

"MARKED FLUCTUATIONS."

The Remonstrance says that the women's school vote in Boston is "subject to marked fluctuations." The men's vote in Boston also shows marked fluctuations.

At the municipal election of December, 1901, the choice of the school committee was a question of exceptional interest. Ten members were to be elected instead of eight (the usual number), and several daily papers had been for months making an active campaign against corruption in the school board and urging everyone to vote. Yet, out of 85,000 men in Boston who voted for mayor, more than 41,000 neglected to mark their ballots for school committee after they were actually at the polls. How many of them would probably have taken the trouble to register and go to the polls in order to vote for the school committee only?

When school suffrage was first granted to the women of Boston, in 1879, only 934 women voted, and for the first seven years the average was only 940. During the last seven years their vote has never fallen below 5,000, and has averaged nearly 8,000. For some years past there has been a steady increase. In 1898 5,201 women voted; in 1899, 7,090; in 1900, 9,542, and in 1901, 11,620.

In answer to the objection that the best women would not vote, Col. T. W. Higginson says: "In Massachusetts, under school suffrage, the complaint has been that only the best women vote."

"IN COLORADO AND WYOMING."

The Remonstrance, referring to recent articles on equal suffrage by Professor Le Rossignol, of the University of Denver, Colo., and Professor Roberts, of the University of Wyoming, says:

> These reports are the first testimony which has been given from impartial observers, and they are in marked contrast with the extravagant claims of the suffragists.

Professor Le Rossignol says: "Woman suffrage has done no harm, while it has done some good, and it has been adopted by Colorado 'for better, for worse.'" Professor Roberts says substantially the same of Wyoming. This is certainly in marked contrast with the extravagant claims of the antisuffragists that equal suffrage would infallibly do no good and much harm, and that it would probably soon be repealed.

The suffragists for the past fifteen years have had a standing challenge, inviting its opponents to find two respectable men in all Wyoming who will assert over their own names and addresses that equal suffrage has had any bad results whatever. The opponents have thus far failed to respond.

NEW ZEALAND SCHOOL BOARDS.

The Remonstrance quotes an anonymous New Zealand woman as saying: "A woman in New Zealand can not legally take her seat on school boards." Women have served on school boards there for more than twenty years.

Hon. Hugh H. Lusk, a former member of the New Zealand parliament, had much to do with framing the education act of 1877, which gave women the school vote and made them eligible to membership on school boards. While visiting America for his health, he spoke at the May festival of the New England Woman Suffrage Association, and gave a sketch of the history of woman suffrage in New Zealand. He said:

> The women got the school vote and used it. They did not say, "Oh, dear, no; it wouldn't be proper." They went to the polls and voted for the best men. They took so much interest that at the next election some women were elected to the school boards; and they showed so much aptitude for this sort of work that when, in 1882, the license question came up, it was proposed that women ratepayers should help choose the board of commissioners in each district who control the issuing of licenses. This met with great objection. We were told that now, indeed, we should utterly destroy the character of the ladies, for all the worst element would be brought in contact with them, and would make things very unpleasant for them. We said: "We don't believe the men of New Zealand are as bad as you think; and if they are, they are not to be trusted to vote alone for these boards of license commissioners." The women were given the license vote. To the surprise and disappointment of their opponents they voted well and met with no trouble, and certainly they greatly improved the licensing boards.
>
> Then we felt that we could go a little further, and gave women the right to vote at municipal elections and to serve on municipal boards. I know one woman who acted for two years as mayor of a very prosperous little town, and did as well as any mayor could have done. The women used their municipal vote well, and so finally in 1893 they were given the full parliamentary franchise.

LOWERING THE MORAL TONE.

The Remonstrance quotes a Mr. J. Grattan Gray, resident somewhere in the immense area of "Australasia"—not necessarily in New Zealand—as saying: "Public and political life and the personnel of parliament have degenerated to a most deplorable degree ever since the introduction of female franchise" in New Zealand.

Hon. Hugh H. Lusk says of the effect of equal suffrage:

> We see it in the changed character of the men who are elected. Character is more regarded than cleverness. It is asked about every candidate, "Has he a good record? Is he above suspicion, an honorable man, a useful citizen, pure of any suspicion of complicity with corrupt politics?" That is the man who, under the combined suffrage of men and women, gets the largest number of votes and is elected.

At the Church Congress in Nottingham, England, the Most Rev. William Gordon Cowie, D. D., Bishop of Auckland and Primate of New Zealand, read a paper on the Colonial Clergy, in which he said:

> Our young New Zealand clergy would also be able to show, from personal experience, how the conferring of the parliamentary franchise on all our women of the age of 21 years has led to no harm or inconvenience, but that the men of New Zealand were wondering why the women of the colony had remained so long without the right to vote at parliamentary elections.

WOMEN AND OFFICE.

The Remonstrance pays a merited tribute to the late president of the Massachusetts Antisuffrage Association, Mrs. J. Elliot Cabot. Mrs. Cabot's personality and life furnished a stronger argument for the fitness of women to vote than any words of hers could furnish against it. In the early days, when the suffragists were trying to obtain for women the opportunity to serve on public boards, a bigoted opponent remarked: "When a man comes home tired at night, he does not want to kiss an overseer of the poor or a member of the school board." Mrs. Cabot served for many years in Brookline as an overseer of the poor, and for ten years as a member of the school board. She was not beloved the less by her family and friends on that account, or less esteemed by the community in which she lived. For her opportunities to render these public services, she was indebted chiefly to the suffragists.

The late venerable Samuel E. Sewall (who was an officer of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association) did more than any other man to secure improved laws for women in that State. For thirty years it was he who drew the bills, helped the women to plead their cause before legislative committees, and obtained a long succession of legal changes. In the Woman's Journal of October 27, 1877, Judge Sewall reviewed the progress that had been made in legislation for women up to that time, and said:

> How has this work been accomplished? By the steady growth of public opinion, promoted and aided in a very great degree, if not entirely created, by the labors of the suffragists. I may add that, when the suffragists first began to move, the prejudice against altering the status of wives, and giving women the public offices into which they have since been introduced, was stronger than that which now resists giving them the ballot.

A pamphlet issued by the "anti" association objects to equal suffrage on the ground that it "involves the holding of office." Is not this rather inconsistent, in view of the fact that its president and several of its leading members have been holders of public offices?

THE TEST OF EXPERIMENT.

Women have now for years been voting, literally by hundreds of thousands, in many different parts of the English-speaking world—in England, Scotland, Ireland, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia; in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, and Kansas. In all these places put together, the opponents have not yet found a dozen respectable men who assert over their own names and addresses that equal suffrage has had any bad results whatever. This scarcity of adverse testimony is the more remarkable in view of the fact that active antisuffrage associations in New York and Massachusetts have been at work for years diligently gathering all the evidence against it they could find. Meanwhile testimony to its good results has been given by the chief justices and all the judges of the supreme court in Wyoming, Colorado, Kansas, and Idaho; by a long list of governors, college presidents, clergymen and representative men and women, and in two of the enfranchised States, by a practically unanimous vote of the State legislature.

STATE ASSOCIATIONS.

The Remonstrance claims that there are antisuffrage associations in four States, and committees in four more. There are suffrage associations in almost every State and Territory of the Union.

Mr. Amos R. Wells, editor of the Christian Endeavor World, the organ of the Christian Endeavor societies, lately addressed letters of inquiry to twenty-five ministers of several different denominations, choosing their names at random among his subscribers in the enfranchised States. He asked, "Is equal suffrage working well, fairly well, or badly?" One of the twenty-five answered that it was working badly and three that it was working fairly well, while the twenty-one others were positive and emphatic in saying that it worked well.

Miss ANTHONY. Now, I wish to present to you Norway, in the person of Mrs. Gudrun Drewsen.

STATEMENT OF MRS. GUDRUN DREWSEN.

Mrs. DREWSEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, Norwegian women look back to the 25th of May as a day of great victory; for on the 25th of May last a bill was passed in our Parliament which granted municipal suffrage to all women paying taxes on a certain limited income, about $100 a year, or whose husbands pay taxes on such income.

This law has thoroughly changed the position of married women in Norway. From having always been a minor, the married woman has suddenly become of age.

It may be of interest to you people of the United States—who can show so many taxpaying women without any right to vote—to know that we were not able to get the men of our Parliament interested in the taxpaying woman suffrage question until the bill was put in such a form that it included the married women also. It seemed to hurt these

men's family feelings. It seemed to them so unjust that the wife and mother should still be standing idle on the market place while their aunts and sisters were the only ones to reap the harvest.

But once having the bill before them in the proper form, our men in Parliament changed their opinion, and liked it so well that not only the radical party, that had presented the bill, but many of the conservative party, that for years had been defiant, also gave their vote and made strong speeches in favor of woman suffrage.

The result of this law has been the election of several women to important municipal positions; for instance, members of the common council in the capital, members of the board of aldermen, and at one place a woman has become chief assessor. Women may act on juries and grand juries, and have been appointed members of special congressional commissions. Several women doctors are appointed at the public institutions, on boards of health as experts for the Government, etc. Matrons have been employed at prisons where women are, and special prisons for women in charge of a matron have been established.

On the whole, we begin to see the glory of the rising sun, which will give us, within a little while, the bright, clear day. [Applause.]

Miss ANTHONY. I now have the pleasure of introducing to you Mrs. Vida Goldstein, of Australia, where women vote.

STATEMENT OF MISS VIDA GOLDSTEIN.

Miss GOLDSTEIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am very proud to think that I have come here from a country where the woman-suffrage movement has made such rapid strides as it has in Australia. The woman-suffrage note was first struck in America, and yet women to-day are struggling here for what we have had in Australia for years and years. And because we have proved all the statements and arguments against woman suffrage to be utterly without foundation, I will take a few minutes of your time just to tell you what our political status is.

It seems incredible to us that the women here in America have not even the school and municipal suffrage, except in a very few States.

We have had woman suffrage in Australia for over forty years, and we never hear a word said against it. It is simply taken as a mere matter of course that the women should go and vote. I have a vote in the municipal council, so I can speak from experience in this matter. I have not had it very long, but for the last five or six years, and although I had always taken the very keenest interest in questions of local government, I never before found that members and candidates and canvassers were ready to listen to my opinions on questions of municipal government; but now I find that things are very different. They tell us as soon as women get these privileges they are going to lose the chivalrous attentions of men. Let me assure you that a woman has not the faintest conception of what chivalry means until she gets a vote. [Laughter.]

In the school boards in Australia women are eligible for election as members. I can remember the time, in Australia, when I was quite a young girl, when there was a howl of opposition to women occupying seats on the school board. They had had the school vote for some time, but when it was suggested that a woman should stand for election

as a member of one of these boards there was a howl of indignation on the part of the general public. But the first woman who stood happened to be put up by the suffrage society, which was the strongest in the country, and they were returned at the head of the poll. From that time women have continued to be members of those boards, and in all the districts now many of them are returned; and the work that they do is considered so satisfactory that the men themselves are the very first to acknowledge that it is desirable to have women on every school board in the country.

As regards parliamentary suffrage, the position is this: South Australia, New Zealand, and West Australia have full parliamentary suffrage for women, and the result has been most satisfactory. The elections are the most orderly that have ever been conducted there. The women have not raided the platforms; they have not neglected their homes; they have not gone away and left their babies. Everything goes on in just the same way as before, except that they manage to get alterations in the laws that previously they had been asking for years and years.

In South Australia, Victoria, Queensland, and Tasmania they have not yet got the parliamentary suffrage, but it is sure to come within this year. The bill for woman suffrage has been introduced in the Houses of Assembly, which are the lower and representative houses of Parliament, over and over again, and every time the bill has been introduced it has secured an increased majority. Eight times now it has passed in Victoria, but it has been blocked by the unrepresentative upper house, which is not elected by the people, but only by a portion of the people.

But now those gentlemen who stood there and blocked our bill every time will have to give way presently, because we now have a federated Australia. And to prove to you the strength of the suffrage movement, I may tell you that the framers of the federal constitution bill were forced to admit that the electors now desired women to have the vote, and they inserted a clause in that instrument giving women the suffrage when they came to deal with their own federal franchise. The elections took place on the franchise existing for the lower house in each state, and as the women in South and West Australia had the right to vote they helped to frame our great Australian Commonwealth.

The federal constitution bill also provides that the suffrage must be made uniform throughout Australia, so that the federal Parliament will have to pass it on the widest franchise existing, and that is in South Australia, where women not only vote but have the right to sit in Parliament; but no woman has ever yet aspired to a seat in Parliament, and that disposes of the argument that the moment women get the vote they are going to rush into Parliament.

Women do not seek public office. That has been the fact in South Australia. When we get national suffrage, state suffrage will follow as a matter of course; because it would be utterly ridiculous to think that we should have the right to vote in national affairs and not in the states, and then these obstructing upper houses will have to give way.

This habit of blocking these bills by the upper house has become such a scandal in our country that there are bills being introduced to reform the upper houses. In Victoria a bill will be introduced almost immediately, and the main plank will be woman suffrage. Then it

will be very inspiriting to us to see these gentlemen having to give way.

When Mr. Reeves, the agent general for New Zealand, was speaking at a large public meeting in London four years ago, he said that he was so absolutely convinced that the suffrage had made such progress in South Australia and New Zealand—and had resulted in so much good—that he was quite certain that within a very few years women in the whole of Australia would be fully enfranchised. Since he made that statement, West Australia has given women full parliamentary suffrage, and the position is such there that the federal Parliament is bound to give it. The federal houses are both of them elected by the people, and of the first national Parliament elected by the people, four-fifths of the members are pledged to give women the vote.

Miss Blackwell referred to a paper published by the Anti-Suffrage Association. In that paper some statements are made against woman suffrage in New Zealand. The source of that information is a Mr. J. Grattan Grey, a journalist "long resident in Australasia." When you remember that Australasia is bigger than the United States, you can see the absurdity of quoting the opinions of a journalist "long resident in Australasia" against woman suffrage. It would be just as reasonable for some one to quote "a journalist long resident in the United States" against woman suffrage in Colorado or any other one State of the American Union. It does not appear that Mr. Grattan Grey ever resided in New Zealand at all. But this gentleman says:

> Not only has woman suffrage not fulfilled any one of the improving and refining services which were claimed for it when the measure was before Parliament, but as an absolute fact public and political life and the personnel of Parliament itself has degenerated to a most deplorable degree ever since the introduction of the female franchise at parliamentary elections in that colony.

You will probably believe me rather than this "journalist long resident in Australasia" when I tell you that those two statements are absolutely untrue. I do not simply voice my own opinions on this matter. I have here the statements of leading representative men and women about the result of woman suffrage in New Zealand. I cite the case of New Zealand because they have had it longest there. They have had it over nine years. These gentlemen are lawyers, clergymen, and educators, men occupying leading positions in the community, representative men occupying good social position.

They say it has distinctly affected legislation. Laws have been made because of it; others have been modified. Changes have been made in the administration of the public service. Changes are being made in public opinion outside the public service. It has raised the tone of political life, since a better class of men are returned to Parliament. It has raised the tone of election meetings. An election meeting now-a-days is as quiet and orderly as any ordinary public meeting. All the saloons are closed on election day, and a place where liquor is sold may not be used as a polling booth. Every election sees an improvement in the quality of the women's vote.

The statement made in the Victoria legislature that the granting of the suffrage to the women of New Zealand had resulted in the election of men of immoral character to seats in the House of Representatives is not true, and is an undeserved reflection upon the women of this colony. The moral tone of the present House of Representatives is equal, if not superior, to that of any of its predecessors, and the legis-

lative assembly and council of Victoria might with advantage take a lesson in regard to the quorum and procedure from New Zealand. It goes without saying that a candidate whose moral character is tainted, or who has not been good to his wife and children, will never get the women's vote. This last is well known, and has a restraining influence in preventing men otherwise well qualified for standing for seats in parliament. As a matter of fact, they will not face the ordeal.

It is largely owing to the women of New Zealand that it is in the van of progress and social reform. The enfranchisement of the women of New Zealand was the result of years of hard fighting. Success crowned our efforts in the end, and the result has been so satisfactory that you never hear any suggestion that these rights should be taken from them.

Now, I want to say to you that if Australia, that land tucked away in that far corner of the world, can trust its women with a vote, why can not you American men do the same? You trust the Indian, you trust thousands and tens of thousands of ignorant, illiterate foreigners who arrive on your shores every year.

I am proud to have the privilege of coming to-day to plead with you to trust your women. You will find your trust is not misplaced. [Applause].

Miss ANTHONY. The next speaker will be Mrs. Emmy Evald, who comes to us from Sweden.

STATEMENT OF MRS. EMMY EVALD.

Mrs. EVALD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I stand here representing a country that gave its women the right of voting in the seventeenth century. Swedish women have voted on the same terms as their brothers in everything except the Second Chamber of the Reichstag; but there is now a bill pending, in which we hope that right will also be granted.

Women are members of school boards, boards of guardians of the poor, parochial boards, and the Government, appreciating women's work, has openly declared that it could not do without them in municipal affairs. I should have stated that it is the real-estate owners that vote in Sweden, irrespective of the sex of the owner. The women in Sweden have voted in the Lutheran Church, which is a State church, since 1736. These Swedish women come here to America, being members of our Lutheran Church. Here it is free; it is not a Government church. Every one of them pays taxes, but they have no vote; they have not voice. The Swedish Americans blame the Americans because their clergy are educated in America, and we feel that they have imbibed the false spirit of liberty and freedom taught by the illiberal men of America.

We do have some women who are equal with men in America, but they are the women who are bad. But what a crying wrong! You say that women are inferior, and you can not give them the ballot, but your law says that you consider bad women equal with men and you mete out the same punishment for them. Would you deny to women the privilege of paying taxes? If they were murderers would you know any difference in the law between the man and the woman? These are not my words, but the words of one of your own Swedish-American citizens, the greatest orator we have in our Lutheran Church.

He is a liberal-minded man, because he was educated in Sweden. You can not trust the ballot in the hands of women teachers in the public schools, but you give it to men who can not write. You do not trust the ballot to women who are controlling millions and who are supporting the country, but you give it to loafers and vagabonds who know nothing, have nothing, and represent nothing. You can not trust the ballot in the hands of women who are the wives and daughters of your heroes, but you will give it to the tramp, or to anyone who is willing to sell it for a glass of beer. You have not trusted the ballot in the hands of Mrs. McKinley simply because she is a woman, but you do trust it in the hands of anarchists.

So, men, let justice speak, and may the public weal demand that this disfranchisement of the noble American women shall be stopped. My heart cries for justice for these American women. I am sure that you men are ashamed of your laws. When it comes to the ballot for women, you withhold it because all do not want it. Do you withhold education because some people do not want it? Do you withhold order and justice because all do not want it? Oh, men, our Lord and Father, the Creator, did not withhold salvation because there are some who do not want it.

A well-known American judge, attempting to convince a fugitive slave that he had made a mistake—this was before your civil war—put the following questions to him:

What did you run away for?
Well, Judge, I wanted to be free.
You had a bad master, I suppose.
Oh, no; berry good massa.
Well, you hadn't a good home?
Haven't I? You should see my pretty cabin in Kentucky.
Had to work hard?
Oh, no; a fair day's work.
If you had plenty to eat, was not overworked, had a good home, and a good master, I don't see why on earth you wanted to run away.
Well, Massa Judge, I spec de situation am still open, if you would like it. [Laughter.]

The judge saw the point and gave the fugitive a $5 bill to help him on his way to freedom. [Applause.] I think we woman suffragists feel something like this fugitive slave. If you ask us, "What in the world do the women want the ballot for?" we reply, "Oh, men, because we want to be free."

But further than that, our situation is open for you, Senators and Representatives of America, if you would like it.

Oh, men, we hail the day and hope and look to the future when American women will be declared equal with men politically as well as socially, as citizens and as human beings. [Applause.]

Miss ANTHONY. I now have the pleasure of introducing to you Rev. Anna Shaw.

STATEMENT OF REV. ANNA H. SHAW.

Rev. ANNA H. SHAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in closing what we women have to say to you this morning in our own behalf, I am not going to make an argument, but to recall to your minds again, as Miss Anthony did in the beginning, that for thirty-two years we have been coming before your honorable body asking

that your committee shall report to the honorable Senate of the United States a bill for a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution.

Miss Anthony gave you the reasons why we want our measure to come before the people in this way rather than by submitting it in State after State and having the laborious work that we have been performing in these past thirty years continued in the years that are to come. I am not going to talk on that point, but there is a point upon which I wish to speak to you. Our association desires you as the representatives of these women not only to report the bill for a sixteenth amendment favorably, but we want you to recommend the appointment of a committee to investigate this subject. Years ago when our women came before your honorable body we had nothing but theory to give you—what we believed would be the result of woman suffrage if it were granted. The opponents of woman suffrage had their theories, and they stated the evils that they believed would follow if the right of suffrage were granted to the women of the country. The theory of one person is as good as that of another until it has been put to the test. But after we have tested the matter both sides must lay aside all theory and stand or fall upon facts as they are presented.

Now, we woman suffragists would like, more than anything else, to stand on the record of woman suffrage where it has been extended in this country.

In four States of our Union women have the full suffrage. For more than thirty years they have been experiencing it in Wyoming equally with the men; in Colorado for nine years, and in Utah and Idaho for about six years. In these different States suffrage has been tested, and while we do not claim that women will be able to change conditions in one year, or ten years, we do believe that twenty-one years at least is a long enough time to measure the effect of a mode of action upon the life of an individual or that of a company of individuals.

We women are perfectly willing to let our case rest upon the result of suffrage in those States. What we would like better than anything else is that the Congress of the United States should grant a committee of investigation; such a committee as you appoint to obtain information in regard to other measures about which you desire the fullest knowledge and information; that such a committee be appointed to investigate the result of woman suffrage in the States where it has already been granted in the Union.

The opponents of woman suffrage come to you with letters from individuals. Everyone of us knows it is absolutely impossible that any matter of legislation should suit everybody. I have no doubt that we could get a large number of letters denouncing the Christian religion from people who consider it an utter failure.

We could doubtless secure an equally large number of letters against man suffrage. To-day the great danger in this country is, not that the women are not loyal to the fundamental principles of our national life, but that the ideal of democracy is dying out in the hearts of the men of the country; and we could get many letters from all over the country to prove that man suffrage in this country is an absolute failure. One of the leading ministers in one of the New England States said to me, not long since, when I lectured in his church upon this subject, "Why do you want to vote? I have not voted for twenty years. Our republican form of government is an absolute failure. Man suffrage has never succeeded and never will. There is but one ideal form

of government in the world and that is an absolute monarchy tempered by assassination."

Now, that was the opinion of a leading minister in this country whose name is known from one end of it to the other.

It is easy to quote the opinions of men and women against the working of any good thing. And so our friends come to us with letters, which I have no doubt are bona fide, letters from people in the States where woman suffage already exists, saying it is a failure. It is quite natural that here and there there should be one who should state this, but we can get hundreds and hundreds of letters stating that it is a success.

This might not convince you gentlemen of the Congress of the United States; but a committee appointed by your body to investigate the subject thoroughly, as it can be investigated by no other body, is and ought to be the way by which you gentlemen can be convinced whether suffrage has or has not been a success in the States where it is already granted.

So sure are we women that your report will be more than favorable to our measure, that we are perfectly willing to stand or fall by its results. So sure are we of the good that has been started in those States by the cooperation of good men and good women, that we know the result would be on our side and not on the other, and we are willing to stake our future by it.

While we do not claim that all good is to come from woman suffrage, or that all women would always vote on the right side of important questions, we do believe that among all the people of a community or of a nation there are more good men and good women than there are bad men and bad women, and that when we unite the good men and good women in any community they will be able to carry measures for the good of the community.

Now the difficulty with so many of our legislators who do not do the will of the best classes of people is not that the legislators do not want the good, it is simply because a large number of the best classes of the people whom they would be glad to serve are not their constituents, and they have not the support and backing of that element; and I believe when all the good men and good women are back of the legislators of our country we will have different laws, we will have different conditions; and instead of the criticism that is passed to-day it will be an altogether different criticism—not because the men will be more deserving than to-day, but because the men will dare to stand up for what the people desire, because of the constituency which is behind them.

While we do not claim, as I say, that women possess all wisdom or all knowledge or all intelligence, or know what is always best for the people, we believe that all the people know more than any part of the people, and that all men and all women know better what is for the general good of the community or the State in which they live than all men alone or all women alone; and that the only way by which we can come to the best interests of a State or the best interests of a family or a church, or any other organized form of existence, is by taking the consensus of opinion of all the people who are old enough and wise enough to give their views upon the subject under consideration.

Therefore the one thing I am here to plead for this morning is the appointment of a committee from the Congress of the United States

to investigate the workings of suffrage in the States where women already have the full vote.

You will notice that our opponents come to you and say the women do not want to vote, because in States where they have had school suffrage no large mass of them have taken advantage of their privilege. They never come to you with that statement concerning States where women have the full suffrage as men have it. It is only where they have this partial suffrage, this educational suffrage, that they make that claim.

You know as well as I do that when a measure relating to education is before the people the only ones who will be interested in it are the people who have their attention directly turned to educational matters; and while it is true that women have not voted upon those questions as numerously as some people might have expected, yet if men were forced to pay a tax and to register every year in order to vote simply on this measure the vote of the men upon those matters would not exceed the vote of the women to-day.

I know in Massachusetts, when I voted for school director, I not only had to register, but when we went to register we found the registrar was out in the hayfield. I took several of the ladies of my own parish and went with them to register. We had to take him away in from the hayfield. He was very busy, and on his way between the hayfield and the house he said many things that are not in the decalogue, and declared that women were a nuisance.

Now, when you go as a citizen to perform your citizen's duty, and the official not only feels but says that you are a nuisance, there is a feeling of timidity that makes you shrink a little. When the whole community look upon you as eccentric and absurd you naturally shrink from doing it, even if it is a duty and you feel obligated to do it.

Then we had to swear to our possessions. I inquired of the men of my parish if they had ever sworn to their possessions in order to pay taxes. They said no, they always waited until after the tax came in before they did that. We women not only have to swear to them beforehand, but we have had to pay pretty dearly for the privilege. In that community a number of women live year after year on a meager bit of an income, as women will. I had an income of $105 a year from a little property which was left me in the will of a friend. I had never gone before the tax collector or hunted him up and told him I had that little bit of property; and being a Methodist preacher he never suspected I had any. [Laughter.] Consequently I was never asked about it. But in order to vote for a member of the school board—not to vote on any appropriation or on any question concerning the school at all, but just to vote for a member of the school board—I had to swear to this property and pay a tax of $22.50 on an income of $105.

Now, while the right of citizenship is a great right and a great privilege, if one has to live on $105 a year, $22.50 is a good deal to pay for the privilege of voting for a member of the school board. I might not have objected had I been able to vote for every officer, from President to pathmaster. So, because of these objections, because of the sentiment of the community in which our women live, because it is not generally regarded to be quite the thing, women do not come out in large numbers to vote where they have only partial suffrage; but where women have the full suffrage, where they can make their influence

it upon the great measures of State and national affairs and all the local questions in the communities where they live, from such places, where they have full suffrage, our opponents never come to you with a statement of the number of the women who do not or who do vote.

Therefore we who favor woman suffrage are perfectly willing to stand or fall on the result of such investigation as would be made by a committee appointed by your honorable body to look over the whole ground. [Applause.]

Miss ANTHONY. The hearing is now over; but we ask if the committee have any questions to put to any of us? If so, we feel confident that these women can answer them.

Senator BERRY. No, I think not.

Miss ANTHONY. Now, we ask you to get the leave of the Senate to print as many copies of this hearing as you possibly can.

The CHAIRMAN. How many copies were printed last year?

Miss ANTHONY. Five thousand; but we should very much like to have 10,000 this year. We can use all you will print, and more too.

The committee, at 11.55 a. m., adjourned

O

4562 050

ACME
BOOKBINDING CO., INC.
JUN 4 5 1985
100 CAMBRIDGE STREET
CHARLESTOWN, MASS.